

From: drupal_admin <drupal_admin@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 8:34 PM
To: HarborComments
Subject: Harbor Comments

Submitted on 09/06/2016 10:34PM

Submitted values are:

Your Name: (b) (6)

Your Email (b) (6)

Your Comments: The Portland Harbor PRAP goes too far in recommending Alternative I. This Alternative does not appropriately balance risk reduction with cost effectiveness. Over a billion dollars will be spent to protect a population that is difficult to quantify in terms of who is eating fish and how much fish is being eaten. EPA's approach should focus on hot spot remediation more in line with Alternative B or D. Expanding remediation will not provide an significant risk reduction relative to cost. EPA needs to update their data used for decision making as recent data shows significant improvement in the river. In addition, EPA has to incorporate and evaluation of sustainability in the remedy to demonstrate the real cost to the environment and economic cost. EPA needs to look hard at what it has proposed and reevaluate the approach to produce a better remedy that doesn't burden Portland.